

REMARKS

Upon entry of this paper, claims 1, 2, and 5-17 would be pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 12, and 13, have canceled claims 3 and 4, and have added new claims 14-17. These changes are not believed to introduce any new matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-5 and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nagasawa et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,384,928 B2) in view of *Inoue et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,273,535 B1). Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1, 2, 8-10, 12, and 13 to specify features that are neither shown nor suggested in the prior art references. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to specify, among other things, a device type acquisition module that accesses the printing device (or image output device) to fetch the type of the printing device (or image output device). Applicants have amended claims 8 and 9 to include, among other things, accessing an image output device to fetch a type of the image output device. Support for the device type acquisition module and the corresponding method operation can be found in Paragraph [0049] of Applicants' specification.

Applicants have amended each of claims 10, 12, and 13 to clarify that the output specification information specifies one particular output device as the destination for output.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 5, and 8-13, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Nagasawa et al.* in view of *Inoue et al.*

In the Final Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nagasawa et al.* in view of *Inoue et al.* and further in view of *Bishay et al.* (U.S. Patent No. U.S. 6,256,350 B1). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nagasawa et al.* in view of *Inoue et al.* and further in view of *Bishay et al.*

and *Parulski* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,937,997 B1). Each of claims 6 and 7 ultimately depends from claim 2. As neither the *Bishay et al.* reference nor the *Parulski* reference discloses or suggests the features added to claim 2, claims 6 and 7 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the applied prior art for at least the reason that they ultimately depend from claim 2.

New Claims

As noted above, Applicants have added new claims 14-17. Each of claims 14-17 specifies features that are neither shown nor suggested in the prior art of record. Support for the recitation in each of claims 14-17 that the output specification information includes the size and the type of the printing paper can be found in Paragraph [0030] of Applicants' specification.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1, 2, and 5-13, as amended herein, as well as examination of new claims 14-17, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP007).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.



Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920